

**OPINION 2366 (Case 3615)*****Polybothris* Dupont, 1833 (Insecta, Coleoptera): spelling conserved**

**Abstract.** The Commission has conserved the spelling of the buprestid beetle genus name *Polybothris* Dupont, 1833. The name was originally published as *Polybotris* but the spelling *Polybothris* has been in prevailing usage since 1900.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; Coleoptera; *Polybothris*; *Polybotris*; BUPRESTIDAE; Africa.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) Under the plenary power the Commission has conserved the spelling of the generic name *Polybothris* Dupont, 1833.
- (2) The name *Polybothris* Dupont, 1833 (gender feminine), type species by monotypy *Polybothris croesus* Dupont, 1833 is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
- (3) The name *croesus* Dupont, 1833, as published in the binomen *Polybotris croesus* (specific name of the type species of *Polybothris* Dupont, 1833) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (4) The name *Polybotris* Dupont, 1833 (ruled in (1) above to be an incorrect original spelling of *Polybothris* Dupont, 1833) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

**History of Case 3615**

An application to conserve the spelling of the buprestid generic name *Polybothris* Dupont, 1833 was received from Patrice Bouchard & Yves Bousquet (*Canadian National Collection of Insects, Arachnids and Nematodes, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada*), Vítězslav Kubáň (*Department of Entomology, National Museum, Praha 4 – Kunratice, Czech Republic*) & Svatopluk Bílý (*Czech University of Life Sciences, Faculty of Forestry and Wood Sciences, Department of Forest Protection and Game Management, Praha 6 – Suchdol, Czech Republic*) on 20 December 2012. After correspondence the Case was published in BZN 70: 19–21 (March 2013). No comments were received on this Case. The title, abstract and keywords of the Case were published on the Commission's website. The Case was sent for vote on 1 December 2014 (VP 29). A greater than two-thirds majority of Commissioners voted FOR the Case (13 For, 4 Against).

**Decision of the Commission**

At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2015 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 13: Alonso-Zarazaga, Ballerio, Bouchet, Brothers, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, Yanega, Zhang and Zhou.

Negative votes – Kojima, Krell, Pape and van Tol.

Bogutskaya, Fautin, Kottelat, Kullander, Lamas, Ng, Pyle and Winston were on leave of absence.

Voting FOR, Grygier said that he was not opposed to the proposals, but was very dissatisfied with the historical summary. As far as he could see, *Polybothris* Dejean,

1836 is an available name under Article 12.2.5 for a concept quite distinct from *Polybotris* Dupont, 1833. Dejean's genus included neither the type species *croesus* of *Polybotris* nor its senior synonym *sumptuosa*. These are, therefore, not just alternative spellings: *Polybothris* is a different name entirely. Nothing was said about its type species; has one ever been designated? These two nominal genera were, in effect, combined by Spinola in 1837, whose use of *Polybothris* must under current rules be deemed contrary to priority, and that is how the matter has mostly rested since then. An explanation was lacking as to why the authorship of *Polybothris* has generally been attributed to Spinola, and not Dejean, and there were no explicit references to non-taxonomic works using *Polybotris* in the 20th Century. He added that there were two side questions: (1) Did Spinola cite Dejean (1836)? and (2) In the account of Spinola's work in para. 4, '*croesus*' is misspelled as '*craesus*'; did Spinola actually spell it that way, or was this a typo? Grygier wondered why the authors of the Case did not propose simply suppressing the almost unused *Polybotris* Dupont. One reason (not stated in the Case) may be that this would leave Dejean, not Spinola, as author of *Polybothris*, and Dejean's genus did not originally include the species that everyone has long accepted as type. Grygier concluded that that being so, the present proposals did make sense, but much of the text leading up to them seemed deficient.

Voting AGAINST, Kojima said that prevailing usage of *Polybothris* seemed to be only among taxonomists working on this beetle group, who could handle this kind of nomenclatural issue within the Code; that is *Polybotris* was the original spelling in Dupont (1833) and *Polybothris* was an incorrect spelling by Spinola (1837), and the original spelling could be kept in this case. Also voting AGAINST, Krell said that assigning a spelling to an author who had not used this spelling was confusing. Also voting AGAINST, Pape said that the genus-group names *Polybotris* Dupont, 1833 and *Polybothris* Spinola, 1837 were different in both spelling and authorship. Creating the name '*Polybothris* Dupont, 1833' would seem an unnecessary chimera. Also, the application appeared to overlook the fact that *Polybothris* was already made available by Dejean (1836) through the inclusion of available specific names.

### Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on either an Official List or Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

- Polybotris* Dupont, 1833, *Magasin de Zoologie*, 3: pl. 77 + 2 unnumbered pages.  
*croesus*, *Polybotris*, Dupont, 1833, *Magasin de Zoologie*, 3: pl. 77 + 2 unnumbered pages.  
*Polybothris* Dupont, 1833 (corrected from *Polybotris* Dupont, 1833), *Magasin de Zoologie*, 3: pl. 77 + 2 unnumbered pages.